

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13 and 15-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, 13, 19-20, and 22-23 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) accompanies this amendment.

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 9-13 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0015455), further in view of Kirsch (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0177120).

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable in view of Liu and Kirsch. Claim 1 as amended refers to the following:

***content publishers, who publish electronic publications, registering the electronic publications*** with a server accessible by a plurality of clients;  
the server storing the registered electronic publications in a database;  
...  
delivering the publication to an inbox associated with the at least one of the plurality of clients ***if the publication is registered and is on the subscribed list.***

(Claim 1 as amended) (emphasis added)

Amended claim 1, thus refers to content publishers, who publish electronic publications, registering the electronic publications with a server, wherein the registered electronic publications are stored in a database, and a publication is delivered to an inbox if the publication is registered *and* is on a subscribed list. In contrast, neither Liu nor Kirsch, alone or in combination, teaches the above limitation.

According to Liu, an electronic publication is blocked or passed based on solely whether a sender of the electronic publication is in a black list of senders or a white list of

senders (Liu, para. [0049]). Liu does not disclose content publishers, who publish electronic publications, registering the electronic publications with a server and delivering a publication if the publication is registered *and* on a subscribed list.

Likewise, Kirsch also fails to disclose content publishers, who publish electronic publications, registering the electronic publications with a server and delivering a publication if the publication is registered and on a subscribed list. According to Kirsch, an email is filtered by a recipient's personal "whitelists" and "blacklists." The "whitelist" is set up by the email recipient and includes a list of recipient approved senders. (Kirsch, para. [0025]) Kirsch does not disclose content publishers registering electronic publications with a server and delivering a publication if the publication is registered and on a subscribed list.

Because neither Liu nor Kirsch, alone or in combination, teaches content publishers registering electronic publications with a server and delivering a publication if the publication is registered and on a subscribed list, claim 1 as amended is patentable over Liu in view of Kirsch for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome.

For similar reasons to these discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 7 and 13 as amended are patentable over Liu in view of Kirsch. Furthermore, claims 3-6, 9-12, and 15-18 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively. Thus, claims 3-6, 9-12, and 15-18 are also patentable over Liu in view of Kirsch. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kirsch (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0177120). Claim 19 as amended sets forth:

content publishers, who publish electronic publications, registering the electronic publications with a server accessible by a plurality of clients;  
for each of the electronic publications, the server randomly assigning a unique address to a respective content publisher, assigning an identification to a respective publication, and storing only the unique address, the identification, and a name of the respective publication in a database;  
(Claim 19 as amended)

In contrast, Kirsch fails to disclose at least the above limitation. Kirsch discloses a central database to store *statistics about emails* and true senders used to access a true sender's reputation (Kirsch, para. [0024]). Kirsch also fails to disclose the server randomly assigning a unique address to a respective content publisher, assigning an identification to a respective publication, and storing only the unique address, the identification, and a name of the respective publication in a database.

Furthermore, Kirsch fails to disclose *content publishers*, who publish electronic publications, registering electronic publications with a server accessible by a plurality of clients. According to Kirsch, the central database receives updates about emails and true senders by *email users* (e.g., recipient 20) within the email network (Kirsch, para. [0024]).

Because Kirsch fails to disclose every limitation set forth in claim 19 as amended, Kirsch does not anticipate claim 19 as amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome.

For the reason discussed above with respect to claim 19, claim 23 is not anticipated by Kirsch. Claims 20-22 and 24-25 depend from claims 19 and 23,

respectively, and thus, are not anticipated by Kirsch. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome.

### CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections and objections have been overcome. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3), applicants hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1/9/2008

By:   
Chui-kiu Teresa Wong  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 48,042

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040  
(408) 720-8300